

To:

see form PCT/ISA 210 **MAIWALD**
Patentanwalts GmbH
04. Mai 2005
MÜNCHEN
FRIST 12.10.

04. Mai 2005

MÜNCHEN

FRIST

12 10

22

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/SA/210 (second sheet)

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

Priority date (day/month/year)
12.12.2003

Applicant
AIRBUS DEUTSCHLAND GMBH

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(I) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCTISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer _____

Thomte, M

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2610



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/014106

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/014106

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

- ☐ the entire international application,
☒ claims Nos. 15-48

because:

- ☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):
☒ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 15,47,48 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

see separate sheet

- ☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
☐ no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.
☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:
the written form ☐ has not been furnished
☐ does not comply with the standard
the computer readable form ☐ has not been furnished
☐ does not comply with the standard
☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.
☐ See separate sheet for further details

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/014106

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-14
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	1-14
	No: Claims	
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-48
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

ad Sections III and VIII

1. Reference is made to the following documents:
D1: DE 100 56 908 A1 (MERCK PATENT GMBH) 23 May 2002 (2002-05-23)
D2: US-A1-2002/002866
2. The variation in wording between the independent apparatus claims 15, 47 and 48 leaves the single general inventive concept linking those claims - required by Article 13, PCT - unclear. In any event, lack of clarity of the claims as a whole arises, since the plurality of independent claims makes it difficult to determine the matter for which protection is sought, and places an undue burden on others seeking to establish the extent of the protection. That is, objection to lack of clarity and inconciseness arises under Article 6, PCT.
In order to overcome this objection the invention should be defined in, at most, one independent claim in any one category followed by claims depending thereon.
3. Even though a detailed examination as to novelty and inventive step under Articles 33(2) and (3) PCT is being deferred until the above-mentioned objection under Article 6 PCT has been rectified it is pointed out that the structural monitoring sensors defined in any of claims 15, 47 and 48 at least does not appear to define anything inventive in view of what is revealed by documents D1 and D2.

ad Section V

4. Methods are known in the art (see eg document D1) for manufacturing sensor structures like that defined by claim 1 for joining a sensor workpiece to a body component region. This is done by providing an adhesive layer to a surface the sensor carrying a patterned surface which is which due to be arranged to an item to be tested by exerting a mechanical pressure upon the parts to be joined together. Claim 1 differs from that what is known from document D1 in that the geometric pattern comprises a plurality of galleries and that these are transferred by means of a light beam that is allowed to penetrate the transfer contact adhesive before the parts are joined together. Since this feature, and thereby the conglomerate of features as

set out in claim 1, is neither known or rendered obvious by the available prior art it is the provisional opinion of the Examiner that claim 1 fulfills the requirements of Article 33 (2) and (3) PCT. This also applies to claims 2 - 14 which depend on claim 1.

5. When pursuing the application with a single independent apparatus claim, the particular subject matter which you consider to fulfill the requirements of Articles 33(2) and (3) PCT should be defined in such a claim. The applicant should also indicate in the letter of reply the difference of the subject-matter of the new claim vis-à-vis the state of the art and the significance thereof.
6. Contrary to the requirements of Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT, the relevant background art disclosed in the documents D1 and D2 is not mentioned in the description, nor are these documents identified therein.
7. The Independent claims on file are not in the two-part form in accordance with Rule 6.3(b) PCT, which in the present case would be appropriate, with those features known in combination from the prior art (document D1) being placed in the preamble (Rule 6.3(b)(i) PCT) and with the remaining features being included in the characterising part (Rule 6.3(b)(ii) PCT).